REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The arguments and amendments presented herein include the arguments and amendments Applicants discussed with the Examiner during phone interview dated April 7, 2010. The Examiner requested Applicants to submit the discussed arguments and amendments for reconsideration, which Applicants present herein. Applicants submit that the arguments and amendments presented herein make the substance of the phone interview of record to comply with 37 CFR 1.133. If the Examiner believes that further information on the interview needs to be made of record to comply with the requirements, Applicants request the Examiner to identify such further information.

Applicants submit that any amendment to the claims herein does not comprise acquiescence or admission that any canceled, amended or supplemented subject matter that existed prior to the amendments herein is not patentable. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claimed subject matter as presented prior to the amendments herein during subsequent prosecution of the present application and in any continuation or related applications.

Applicants note that the Office Action Summary of OA5 does not list claims 31 and 32 as pending, when they are in fact pending. Further, the Examiner applied the prior art rejection to claims 31 and 32 on pgs. 2 and 6 of OA5. Thus, claims 31 and 32 should be listed as pending. Applicants note that claim 44 is canceled, although the Office Action Summary shows it pending. Applicants further note that claims 45 and 47 are pending, although they are not indicated as pending in the Office Action Summary.

1.   Claims 1-4, 7-10, 31-34, 36-43, and 45-48 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 7-10, 31-34, 36-43, and 45-48 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Moehrle (U.S. Patent No. 7,216,301) in view of Rochford (U.S. Patent No. 6,633,312) and Weber (U.S. Patent No. 7,370,281). Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

Amended claims 1, 31, and 40 recite: rendering a display of names of a first and second data sets in a search panel, wherein each data set is associated with one or more file components; receiving selection of the displayed first data set name in the search panel; displaying names of the file components associated with the selected first data set in the search panel; receiving selection of at least one of the displayed file component names associated with the selected first

data set; rendering the selected data set name and the selected at least one selected file component name in a history panel, wherein the selected first data set name and selected at least one file component are displayed in a hierarchical tree arrangement, and wherein the history panel and the search panel are rendered concurrently in a graphical user interface; receiving selection of the displayed second data set name in the search panel; displaying names of the file components associated with the selected second data set in the search panel; receiving selection of at least one of the displayed file component names associated with the selected second data set; and rendering the selected second data set name and the selected at least one selected file component name associated with the selected second data set in the history panel, wherein the selected first and second data set names and selected file components associated with the first and second data sets are displayed together in the hierarchical tree arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data sets and wherein the rendered selected first and second data set names and the selected file components in the history panel are rendered concurrently in the graphical user interface with the search panel separately rendering the selected displayed file component names associated with the selected second data set name.

Applicants amend these claims to include the requirement that the rendered selected first and second data set names and the selected file components in the history panel are rendered concurrently in the graphical user interface with the search panel separately rendering the selected displayed file component names associated with the selected second data set name. This added requirement is disclosed in at least FIGs. 2, 3, 6 and 7 and paras. 12-16 of the filed Specification. Applicants further amend these claims to remove the requirement that the file components include source code files being accessed by a developer.

During the phone interview, the Examiner said the above amendments could overcome the cited art and requested the Applicants to present for reconsideration and to update the search.

The Examiner cited FIG. 4A, element 102, FIG. 4B, elements 10b-10d, FIG. 4C, and col. 5, lines 6-9 of Moehrle as teaching the pre-amended claims. (OA5, pgs. 2-3) Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

The cited FIG. 4A, element 102 provides an initial view of an active path having a single active link. Moehrle defines an active path as a sequence of active links as items, where an active link provides direct access to a function corresponding level or menu item without the

need to navigate using a GUI. (Moehrle, col. 2, lines 45-51). FIGs. 4B shows a user browsing the active path 100 of FIG. 4A, rolling over active link 1.2.3 causes the display of all siblings of the rolled over active link, 1.2.3.1, 1.2.3.2, 1.2.3.3.... Rolling over an active link displays the siblings and children of the active link. (Moehrle, col. 5, lines 27-32)

The cited Moehrle discusses displaying hierarchical active links or menu items that are used to execute functions. (Moehrle, col. 5, lines 4-20). This does not teach or suggest rendering the selected second data set name and a selected file component name in a search panel and concurrently rendering a history panel showing the selected first and second data set names and the selected file components in a hierarchical tree arrangement, where the search and history panels separately and concurrently render their information. Instead, the cited FIGs. 4B and 5A of Moehrle show a single menu tree to select active links arranged in a hierarchical fashion. The cited Moehrle does not teach showing separate search and history panels that concurrently and separately render in the graphical user interface the selected first and second data set names and the selected file components in the history panel and the selected displayed file component names associated with the selected second data set name in the search panel. Instead, the cited Moehrle shows a single menu system as in FIGs. 4B and 5A that shows active links as they are selected in a "drill down" manner.

Moreover, the cited active links of Moehrle do not comprise a data set name and selected file component name of the selected data set name as claimed.

The Examiner further found that

It can be seen from the teachings of Moehrle that during the normal course of operation the user may initiate another search by returning to a previous level and repeating the steps of opening a second data set and selecting a second file component from the second data set and display a hierarchical history of browsing in the panel (ie. Top line)

(OA5, pg. 3)

Applicants traverse this finding because Moehrle concerns displaying active links. If an active link selected is not an end link, then subordinate levels are displayed, if an end link is selected, the associated function is re-executed. (Moehrle, col. 5, line 65 to col. 6, line 21) The claims require selection and display of data set names and component files of the data set names including source code files. The cited Moehrle concerns the display of active links to

provide selection of functions associated with active links, not selection of data set names and their component files including source code files being accessed by a developer as claimed.

The Examiner cited FIGs. 2A and 8 and accompanying text of Rochford as teaching the claim requirements of upon selecting a first and second data set names in a search view and selecting file components of the first and second data set names in the search panel, the selected first and second data set names and selected file components are displayed in a separate history panel that displays to together selected first and second data set names and the selected file components of the selected first and second data set names separately from the search panel in which the data set and file component names were selected. (OA5, pg. 3) Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

Rochford discusses a layer cake selection window in which the user may select regions and attributes to display network components for the selected region and attributes. FIGs. 2A-3B of Rochford show how a user may select a region as a base view and then select an attribute to further narrow the display to network features in the base view region. (Rochford, cols. 7-8 and 11-13) The cited FIG. 8 is a history window in which selected features are displayed, where if a selected attribute is dependent on the base view, such as a selected region, then the base view on which the selected feature depends is also displayed. (Rochford, col. 17, lines 3-19)

The cited FIG. 8 of Rochford does not teach or suggest the amended claim requirement of separate search and history panels that concurrently and separately render in the graphical user interface the selected first and second data set names and the selected file components in the history panel and the selected displayed file component names associated with the selected second data set name in the search panel. Further the cited FIG. 8 does not teach rendering the selected first and second data set names and the selected file component name in a history panel, wherein the selected first and second data set names and selected file components associated with the first and second data sets are displayed together in the hierarchical tree arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data sets. Instead, the cited FIG. 8 discusses displaying in a history panel attributes of network features and the geographical region for which the attribute was selected.

The cited history panel of FIG. 8 discusses displaying the region and network attributes used to filter a search. This does not teach displaying concurrently and separately search and history panels that separately render the selected displayed file component names in the search

panel and the file component names associated with the first and second selected data set names in the history panel. Further, the history panel of Rochford cannot display selected data set names and selected file component names of the selected data set because Rochford does not display components of a data set name, but instead displays regions and network attributes used to filter a search.

The Examiner cited FIG. 1 and ref. 2 and 4 of Weber as teaching that the file components comprise source code files. (OA5, pgs. 4-5) Applicants amend these claims to remove the requirement that the file components comprise source code files. The cited Weber discusses using a GUI interface for Java source files in a Java application development environment. Weber discussion of displaying source code does not address the above discussed shortcomings of Weber and Rochford.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended claims 1, 31, and 40 are patentable over the cited art because the cited Moehrle, Rochford, and Weber do not teach or suggest all the claim requirements.

Claims 2-4, 7-10, 32-34, 36-39, 41-43, and 45-48 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 31, and 40, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above, and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims and any intervening claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art. Moreover, the following dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claims 2, 32, and 41 depend from claims 1, 31, and 40, and further require that the first and second data set names are displayed as a parent at a higher hierarchical level to the file components associated with the displayed first and second data set names, wherein the file components are rendered as children in the history panel of the first or second data set with which they are associated.

The Examiner cited FIG. 4B, 10a-102, 101 and col. 3, lines 22-23 of Moehrle and FIG. 8 of Rochford with respect to these claims. (OA5, pg. 6)

The cited FIG. 4B of Moehrle shows menu items that are siblings, where the menu items are active links. Rolling over an active link with a pointer results in the display of siblings and children of the active link. (col. 5, lines 27-31) The active links are functions that may be executed. Nowhere does the cited FIG. 4B teach a history panel that displays a selected first and

second data set names as a parent to their associated file components, including source code files, which is different from the search panel displaying data set names and file component names which the user may select. Instead, the cited FIG. 4B displays a hierarchical arrangement of active links that may be selected to execute a function, not those selected data set file component names as claimed. The cited col. 3 references the detailed description.

The cite FIG. 8 of Rochford discusses a history panel showing searched regions and network attributes used to filter a region search in a history panel. This does not teach displaying data set names as a parent at a higher hierarchical level to file components including source code files. The Examiner has not cited where Rochford teaches that the cited regions are at a parent hierarchical level to the network features also used to filter the search. Instead, the cited Rochford discusses how the network features searched on are dependent on the previous base view or region filtering. However, there is no teaching that the region comprises a parent at a higher hierarchical level to the network feature searched upon in FIGs. 3A and 3B.

Accordingly, dependent claims 2, 32, and 41 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of these claims are not taught or suggested in the cited Moehrle and Rochford.

Claims 4, 34, and 43 depend from claims 1, 31, and 40, respectively, and further require transmitting a request for file component names of the selected data set name, wherein the displayed file component names comprise file component names returned in response to the transmitted request for file component names.

The Examiner cited col. 9, lines 16-20 as disclosing the additional requirements of these claims. (OA5, pg. 6) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 9 mentions a data file representing the hierarchical structure of a multi-level hierarchical website is either constructed or retrieved from the server. The data file representing the information hierarchy of the location may be dynamically created from the directory structure and the hypertext markup language (HTML) available on the server and client files.

Although the cited col. 9 mentions retrieving a data file representing a hierarchical structure of a web site, this does not teach transmitting a request for file components, including source code files, of a selected data set name, where the displayed file component names for the selected data set name are the file component names returned in response to the transmitted

request for the file component names. Instead, the cited col. 9 discusses retrieving a data file representing a hierarchical structure of a web site, not file component names associated with a selected data set name.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that dependent claims 4, 34, and 43 provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of are not taught or suggested in the cited combination of Moehrle and Rochford.

2.   Added Claims 49, 50, and 51

Added claims 49, 50, and 51 depend from claims 1, 31, and 40, respectively, and recite that the file components include source code files being accessed by a developer.

These added requirements were canceled from the independent claims.

These added claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from one of claims 1, 31, and 40, which are patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above, and because the additional requirements of these claims in combination with the base claims and any intervening claims provide further grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-4, 7-10, and 31-34, 36-43, and 45-51 are patentable. Should any additional fees be required beyond those paid, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: April 7, 2010   By:____/David Victor/_____

David W. Victor
Registration No. 39,867